



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Princesse de Lamballe, occupied the royal loge, and there was a most brilliant audience.

The play was applauded for its many *beaux vers*, and was considered a wonderful performance for one so young, although it received harsh treatment at the hands of the critics. But whatever its merits or defects, *Méléagre* was never given a second time. Grimm said¹: "Ce jeune auteur et ses amis ont eu le bon esprit de retirer la pièce après la première représentation." M. Ernest Legouvé relates² that after the performance Lemer cier went behind the scenes, to thank the actors, according to the prevailing custom, and then asked the prompter to give him the manuscript for a few corrections. He took it away, and the next day, M. Legouvé says, he wrote the following letter to the members of the Comédie :

"*Messieurs* :—

Mon succès d'hier m'a beaucoup touché, mais ne m'a pas fait illusion. Ma pièce est une œuvre d'enfant, c'est un enfant que le public a applaudi pour l'encourager ; je n'ai qu'une manière de me montrer digne de son indulgence, c'est de ne pas en abuser. De telles bontés ne se renouvellent pas. Je retire mon ouvrage et je tâcherai que ma seconde tragédie soit plus digne de vos talents."

Whereupon there was great confusion at the theatre among the actors who had been looking forward to a number of profitable performances.

This explanation of the single performance of the play has been accepted without question. Vauthier in his thesis on Lemer cier³ quotes the letter just given, in good faith, Lenient⁴ tells the same story, and Le Roy⁵ copies the letter in full, without even giving Legouvé credit for it, although his source is evident, from the context. Influenced by this explanation, great things have been said regarding the modesty of the young Lemer-

cier, and his clear judgment as to the real value of his tragedy.

M. Legouvé's letter, however, for which he gives neither reference nor authority, is evidently the creature of his own imagination, when compared with the following communication which actually appeared in the *Journal de Paris*, March 4, 1788 :

"*Aux Auteurs du Journal*.

Messieurs :—Permettez moi de me servir de la voie de votre journal pour remercier le Public des applaudissements dont il a daigné m'honorer : je suis trop reconnaissant pour ne pas corriger, autant qu'il est en moi, les défauts de mon Ouvrage. Je n'ai suspendu la seconde représentation de *Méléagre* qu'afin d'avoir le temps de faire les changements nécessaires.

LEMERCIER."

This letter is more than enough to show that Lemer cier had no intention of withdrawing *Méléagre* permanently, nor does it reveal any excessive modesty on his part. Whether his friends finally prevailed upon him to withdraw his play or whether the management of the theatre was unwilling to go on with it, may never be known, but it is certain that this boy of seventeen had no doubt of his own literary ability, and that he was anticipating a continuance of success.

While the point here involved is certainly not of vital importance, it deserves consideration, nevertheless, because hesitation and lack of self-assurance are so entirely foreign to Lemer cier's character, that no careful student of his life and work has been able to accept this oft-repeated story without wonder and surprise.

JOHN R. EFFINGER.

The University of Michigan.

¹ *Correspondance littéraire*, vol. xiv, mars 1788.

² *Soixante Ans de Souvenirs*, par E. Legouvé, Paris. 4 vols. in-12. Vol. i, p. 80.

³ *Essai sur la Vie et les Oeuvres de Népomucène Lemer cier*, par G. Vauthier. Toulouse, 1886, gr. in-8, p. 7.

⁴ *La Comédie en France au XIX^e Siècle*, par Ch. Lenient, Paris, 1904. 2 vols. in-8. Vol. i, p. 27.

⁵ *L'Aube du Théâtre Romantique*, par Albert Le Roy, Paris, 1904, in-8, p. 135.

ENGLISH ORTHOGRAPHY.

Two dissertations appeared in 1904 on the English Orthography of the sixteenth century : Rudolf, *Die englische Orthographie von Caxton bis Shakespeare*, Marburg, 1904, and Swearingen, *Die englische Schriftsprache bei Coverdale, mit*

einem Anhang über ihre Weiterentwicklung in den Bibelübersetzungen bis zu der Authorized Version 1611, Berlin, 1904.

The Orthography of the English Bible translations in the sixteenth century is in several instances different from that of the prose works investigated by Rudolf. The difference is, for the most part, in the matter of uniformity in the spelling of single words. The Bibles, from Coverdale (1535) on, have a tendency to select from the several spellings of the word, which existed at the time, one form, and use that consistently as in modern printing. Double forms, which have never entirely disappeared from English spelling and were still more frequent as late as Dr. Johnson (Swearingen, p. 51), are found less often in the Bibles than in other prose works of the same time.

Together, which appears in the Bibles from Coverdale on, with only the one spelling, alternates in other prose works with *together* until 1586 (R., p. 5).

Hither, thither, whither, alternate (according to Rudolf's results (p. 6)) with *hether, thether, whether*, throughout the sixteenth century. The Geneva Bible (1557) has *e* in these words in isolated cases; otherwise, the spelling with *i* is uniform from Coverdale on.

Give and *geve* never appear side by side in the Bibles. From Coverdale to the Geneva Bible of 1557, *geve* is the only form. From the second edition of the Geneva Bible (1560) *give* is settled. According to Rudolf (p. 5), Greene (1593) is the first to decide for *give*.

Sword with *o*, through the influence of the preceding *w*, is found for the first time as the regular form in the Geneva Bible of 1557. In the preceding Bibles *sweard(e)* is the only form. Rudolf (p. 8) gives *sword* as the prevailing form since Elyot 1531. In this case the Bibles are less modern, as the form established by the printer of the Coverdale Bible is adhered to in the other Bibles.

Joy (1535) is given by Rudolf (p. 23) as the last to use *ether* and *nether*. These are the only forms in the Bibles until 1582, when they are replaced by *either* and *neither*. Here again the Bibles are archaic in adhering to this form, but modern in not printing two spellings of the same word side by side.

Coverdale's is the last one of the Bibles in which *ai* and *a* in open syllable alternate. In other prose works this was not regulated until after Shakespeare (R., pp. 17 and 22).

The conjunction *lest* and the superlative *least*, which Rudolf gives (p. 16) as not kept separate throughout the sixteenth century, are never confused in the Coverdale Bible. In the later Bibles, however, an occasional *least*, *leest* for *lest* (conj.) is met; and, in isolated cases, *lest* as the spelling of the superlative.

Rudolf (p. 6) says: "Bis Ascham (W 47) tritt neben *suck* (me. *swich*) auch *soch* auf; später ist *suck* vorherrschend." The Bibles, on the other hand, have only *much* and *suck* from the Geneva (1557) on.

The form *werk* occurs in a Bible for the last time, and then only in isolated cases, in Tindale's 1525-26 version. *Work* is the only form from Tindale's 1534 edition on. Rudolf (p. 8) gives *werk* by the side of *work* up to Joy 1535 and *warke* as late as Udall, 1552.

Caxton, Greene, and Dekker (R., p. 9) have used *then* and *than* as they are printed to-day. One of Tottel's authors, Grimald, also made this distinction. The Bibles, like most of Rudolf's authors, use only the one form *then* with both meanings. This is also true of the Shakespeare Folio (1623), and of Newman's *Bible Concordance* (London, 1650) in which *than* does not appear.

Whan and *when* are printed side by side until Ascham (1568) according to Rudolf (p. 9). The Geneva Bible of 1557 and later Bibles have only *when*.

Should and *would*, as constant spellings with no exception, are first met in the Rheims Bible (1582), and continue in the Authorized Version of 1611. Greene is the first author given by Rudolf (p. 11) as using only the modern English spelling of both words.

The irregularity in the use of the silent end *-e*, which characterized the printing of the sixteenth century (R., p. 31 f.), did not extend to the Bibles. An end *-e* is never added to a word whose short vowel would by the addition be placed in open syllable; nor is it ever omitted after a single consonant following a single long vowel. The only places where it is variable are where length is already marked by two vowels, or

where a single vowel is followed by two consonants and the presence or absence of the end *-e* would decide nothing about the quantity.

From the above comparison it is evident that it is in the printing of the Bible translations of the sixteenth century that the decided steps toward a uniform English spelling are to be traced.

GRACE FLEMING SWEARINGEN.

Knox College.

FRANCISCO PACHECO AND THE ITALIANS.

That during the time of Italianism in Spanish literature the poets, especially those of minor degree, did not always restrict themselves to imbibing Italian spirit and imitating Italian forms, a careful perusal of the poets of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries shows. While there is a very close leaning upon Italian originals, it is not often that we find literal translations, honestly admitted, as in the case of Francisco Pacheco, the painter-poet, 1571-1654.

Pacheco's *Poetas*, together with a short sketch of his life, have been published by Adolfo de Castro,¹ and fill about two pages in large quarto. The few verses, most of them translations, would hardly warrant their author's claims to immortality, but there are three other points: he wrote an *Art of Painting*, published in 1649, he was the close friend of Fernando de Herrera, "el Divino,"—one of the boldest "borrowers" the Spanish literature owns,—and also published his works, which he accompanied with an original sonnet; last but not least, he married his daughter to the prince of painters and painter of princes, Don Diego de Velasquez. Almost his whole lyric reverts to his profession. One sonnet, included in the *Arte de la Pintura*, is addressed to Velasquez, after his having completed his large equestrian picture of Philip IV of Spain. An "Enigma" has as its title and solution *el pincel*, 'the paint brush'; two "Epigramas" are thrusts at devices of bad painters. His translations consist of verses

in honor of Michel Angelo—though not with regard to his paintings but his sculptures.

Of Pacheco's translations, the first in order is one on the death of the great Florentine (1564) after the original of *Laura Batiferri degli Ammannati*, a poetess of ephemeral fame. Gaspari² just mentions her; but Giambatista Corniani says of her: "Laura Battiferri da Urbino compose elegante poesie (stampate in Firenze dai Giunti, l'a. 1552) ed una versione in versi toscani de' sette salmi penitenziali assai applaudita (stampate ivi nel 1564). Fu essa moglie del celebre scultor fiorentino Bartolomeo degli Ammannati. Copia degna d'immortal ricordanza! . . ."³

Her sonnet cannot have been in either of the above mentioned collections. Very likely Pacheco used the original title, "A la muerte de Michel Angelo" (Traduccion del que escribiò Laura Batiferri degli Ammannati). The verses are stately, though conventional, the Italian is easily read through the thin Spanish covering, with one or two rather forced synæreses for the sake of scanning.

The other translations are of well-known Italian verses. One is a madrigal by Marino on Michel Angelo's *Pietà*. It is preserved to us in the second division "Sculpture" in the famous *Galeria del Cavalier Marino*. In the little Venetian edition of the Ciotti, 1620, it is found on p. 27, Div. II; the two pages 26 and 27 contain four madrigals—thus Pacheco styles the one, and we may assume the name for the other three. Three of these madrigals are of eight lines each, the fourth has ten. They treat: 1) "*La Notte di Michel Angelo Buonarroti*," 2) "*L'Aurora del Medesimo*," 3) "*La Pietà del Medesimo*," 4) "*Mosè del Medesimo*."

La Pietà runs as follows:

Sasso non è costei
Che l'estinto figliuol, freddo qual ghiaccio,
Sostien pietosa in braccio,
Sasso più tosto sei
In che non piagni a la pietà di lei
Anzi sei più che sasso,
Che suole anco da' sassi il pianto uscire,
E i sassi si spezzaro al suo morire.—

² *Geschichte der Italienischen Literatur*, Vol. II, p. 508.

³ *I Secoli della Letteratura Italiana dopo suo Risorgimento*. Milan, 1832, Vol. I, p. 450.

¹ *Biblioteca de Autores Españoles: Poetas Liricos de los siglos XVI y XVII*. Madrid, 1872.